



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/451,269	11/30/1999	MARTINUS J. TOPS	PHN.17.186	8816

24737 7590 07/30/2003

PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS
P.O. BOX 3001
BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510

EXAMINER

ZIMMERMAN, GLENN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2879

DATE MAILED: 07/30/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/451,269

Applicant(s)

TOPS ET AL.

Examiner

Glenn Zimmerman

Art Unit

2879

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 May 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 16-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 16-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 23 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 30 November 1999 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

Amendment, filed on May 9, 2003, has been entered and acknowledged by the examiner. The amendment to the specification on page 2 of the amendment C of May 9, 2003 has not been entered as the directions are defective MPEP 714.23 as there are no lines 28 and 29 in page 8 of the substitute specification. The examiner suggests the resubmission of directions to locate where this amendment should go.

The substitute specification, filed on June 6, 2002, has been entered and acknowledged by the examiner on August 14, 2002.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 16-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 16 is rejected because the claim mentions "said individual wires" on line 14 where there are two previously mentioned "said individual wires". In other words the limitation is unclear as to which "said individual wires" that the claim is referring to.

A 112 2nd paragraph rejection has been determined for claim 16, as written about above. However, a further evaluation of the claim will be done while interpreting "said individual wires" in line 14 as "said individual wires of said coil portions".

Claims 17-21 are rejected for depending from a rejected claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 16, 19 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by the applicant's admitted prior art.

Regarding claim 16, the applicant's admitted prior art (**page 3 line 7**) discloses a deflection coil (**conventional deflection unit Fig. 4A**) for a cathode ray tube, the deflection coil comprising: a rear flange (**Fig. 4A no ref. #**) and a front flange (**flange ref. 17**), the rear flange and the front flange each comprising a respective plurality of individual wires (**page 6 line 13**) forming portions of wire turns (**Fig. 4A no ref. #**), one of the flanges having a first flange portion (**Fig. 4A no ref. #**) comprising a first plurality of the individual wires (**Fig. 4A no ref. #**), and the one of the flanges having a second flange portion (**Fig. 4A no ref. #**) comprising a second plurality (**Fig. 4A no ref. #; page 6 line 13**) of the individual wires not including the first plurality,

A plurality of coil portions (**Fig. 4A no ref. #**) fanning out in a fan shaped manner (**Fig. 4A no ref. #**) from the rear flange to the front flange, individual wires of the coil portions being connected respectively to the individual wires forming portions of wire turns in the flanges, and

A current supply wire (**current-supply wire ref. 22**) having a first portion extending from one of the individual wires of said coil portions along the first portion of the one of the flanges, arranged so as to cross and be attached to but electrically insulated from the first plurality of the individual wires, and the current supply wire having a second portion (**page 6 line 14; Fig. 4A ref. 22 unattached portion**) free from attachment to the second plurality of the individual wires.

The examiner notes that figure 4A, which is prior art, is an exact copy of 4B which is the proposed novel art. The main difference between figure 4A and 4B is that figure 4A contains the undesirable groove of reference 42. Therefore the examiner notes that if figure 4A is an exact copy of figure 4B then figure 4A will meet, as a 102 admitted prior art reference, all of the limitations of the claim. When copies of Fig. 4A and 4B are put overlapping and observed toward a light one can clearly see that they match each other and are the same except for the groove. Figures 4A and 4B use the same reference numbers which is indicia that they are the same type of deflection unit.

Regarding claim 19, the applicant's admitted prior art disclose the deflection coil claimed in claim 16, characterized in that the first portion of the current supply wire extends outwardly along the first flange portion to the second portion of the current supply wire, and the second flange portion is disposed outwardly of the first flange

Art Unit: 2879

portion. The examiner again notes that Figure 4A, which is prior art, is an exact copy of Figure 4B except for the groove ref. 42. Figure 4B meets the limitations of claim 19, so therefore figure 4A meets the limitations of claim 19. The examiner notes that the groove ref. 42 of Figure 4A does not affect any of the limitations of this claim.

Regarding claim 22, the applicant's admitted prior art disclose a deflection coil (**conventional deflection unit Fig. 4A**) for a cathode ray tube, the deflection coil comprising: a rear flange (**Fig. 4A no ref. #**) and a front flange (**flange ref. 17**), one of the flanges having a width (**Fig. 4A no ref. #**) comprising a first flange portion (**Fig. 4A no ref. #**) and a second flange portion (**Fig. 4A no ref. #**), the first flange portion comprising a first plurality of individual wires (**Fig. 4A no ref. #**) and the second flange portion comprising a second plurality of individual wires (**Fig. 4A no ref. #**) not including the first plurality,

A plurality of coil portions fanning out in a fan-shaped (**Fig. 4A no ref. #**) manner from the rear flange to the front flange, and

A current supply wire (**current-supply wire ref. 22**) having a first portion (**Fig. 4A no ref. #**) crossing the first flange portion, arranged so as to be attached to but electrically insulated from the first flange portion, and the current supply wire having a second portion (**Fig. 4A no ref. #**) free from attachment to the second flange portion.

The examiner again notes that Figure 4A, which is prior art, is an exact copy of Figure 4B except for the groove ref. 42. Figure 4B meets the limitations of claim 22, so therefore figure 4A meets the limitations of claim 22.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the applicant's admitted prior art in view of Honda et al. U.S. Patent 5,859,495.

Regarding claim 17, the applicant's admitted prior art teach all the limitations of claim 17, but fail to teach characterized in that said second plurality of the individual wires is free from impression. Honda et al. in the analogous art teach wherein characterized in that said second plurality of the individual wires is free from impression (**col. 6 lines 23-24**). Additionally, Honda et al. teach incorporation of such a screen side flange without a dent to improve the prevention of damage to the coil wires in production of the screen side flange portion (**col. 6 lines 26-31**).

Consequently it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have said second plurality of the individual wires free from impression in the deflection coil of the applicant's admitted prior art since such a modification would help prevent damage to the coil wires in production of the screen side flange portion as taught by Honda et al.

Allowabl Subject Matter

Claims 18, 20, 21 and 23 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claims 18, 20 and 21 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, set forth in this Office action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

Regarding claims 18, 20 and 23, the following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance: The prior art of record neither shows nor suggests a deflection coil including the combination of all the limitations as set forth in claim 18 or 20 or 23, and specifically characterized in that the first portion of the current supply wire is attached to the first flange portion over a length L, where L is $1/6^{\text{th}}$ to $1/3^{\text{rd}}$ of the width D could not be found elsewhere in prior art.

Regarding claim 21, claim 21 is allowed for the reasons given in claim 20, because of its dependency status on claim 20.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 13-15 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Glenn Zimmerman whose telephone number is (703) 308-8991. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nimesh Patel can be reached on (703) 305-4794. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 308-7382 for regular communications and (703) 308-7382 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is n/a.



Glenn Zimmerman
July 15, 2003



ASHOK PATEL
PRIMARY EXAMINER